

about the beauty that God had blessed us with, this natural beauty. But what he was really was encouraged with, and I want to read this, "But not until I went to the churches of America and I heard her pulpits flamed with righteousness did I understand the secret of her genius and power. America is great because America is good. And if America ever ceases to be good, America will cease to be great."

Mr. Speaker, there is also another quote that I think goes back to Jeff Jacoby with the Boston Globe that I read back in 1995, my first year in the United States Congress, when he said that religion can survive in the absence of freedom, but freedom without religion becomes dangerous and unstable.

And what I am seeing happening in this country today bothers me greatly. When I think about the young men and women that are dying in Afghanistan and Iraq, they are dying so the Iraqi people can have freedom, and yet in this great Nation known as America, our priests, our preachers, rabbis and clerics cannot have the first amendment rights.

Let me share a quote with you from Floyd Flake. Floyd Flake, Mr. Speaker, was one of the finest Members of this United States House of Representatives. He is a minister in New York City. And I want to read this for you very quickly. It is a letter about the bill I put in to return freedom of speech to our churches and synagogues. He says, "I praise God for the stand that you have taken to defend the first amendment rights of houses of worship. It is unjust that churches and clergymen and women are unfairly targeted when they exercise their rights as American citizens. I am pleased to offer my whole-hearted support with sincere prayer for passage of this important and liberating legislation."

Mr. Speaker, I will close, but I want to say that I hope that the colleagues of mine in this House will join me in returning the first amendment rights to our churches, our synagogues and our mosques.

I close by asking God to please bless our men and women in uniform and their families and my God continue to bless and help save America.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4613, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2005

Mrs. MYRICK, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 108-559) on the resolution (H. Res. 683) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4613) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2005, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

THE ADMINISTRATION'S FAILURE TO DESTROY A TERRORIST CAMP

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GERLACH). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, last week the independent 9/11 Commission said it found "no credible evidence to substantiate the charge that there was a relationship between Saddam Hussein and Iraq and 9/11. We have no credible evidence that Iraq and al Qaeda cooperated on attacks against the United States." Yet, 2 days later, Vice President CHENEY said that, in fact, that was not true, that there were long established ties with al Qaeda.

Now, of course, Vice President CHENEY has quite a distinguished record as Vice President. He was the gentleman of 3 years ago said during the energy crisis in the western United States that those of us who thought there was market manipulation were really pretty stupid, and this was just market forces at work and there was no manipulation of the market. And Enron was a wonderful and upstanding company. Of course, now Enron officials, one after another, are going to jail, and hopefully Ken Lay will be criminally indicted this week. But the Vice President waxed eloquent there as he did here.

He also has said that deficits do not matter despite the fact we will borrow \$700 billion against our future and obligate Americans for generations to pay that money back. He says that does not matter perhaps because his tax policy that he and the President envision says that only wage earners and salary earners will repay that and the wealthy and those that you normally associate with and corporations will not pay. But, nonetheless, he said again trying to raise the old saw about this relationship perhaps because although he told us that he knew exactly where the weapons of mass destruction were, he failed to point any of the U.S. troops, the inspectors or anybody who has been in Iraq for the last year and a half to that exact spot where he knew those weapons were located.

So it is a continuing attempt at obfuscation. The one thing they point to does have a kernel of truth, and they point to terrorist Abu Musab Zarqawi. He is a really bad guy. He has been behind more than 700 terrorist killings in Iraq it is estimated, a mastermind.

In June 2002, the United States intelligence service located Mr. Zarqawi and they said he had set up a weapons lab in Kirma, in northern Iraq. He was producing ricin and cyanide. The Pentagon drafted plans and asked the Bush administration to take out Mr. Zarqawi. The Bush administration said no.

Then we went 4 months later, and this is all from a report by Jim Miklaszewski, a correspondent for NBC news. Four months later, Intelligence showed that Zarqawi was planning to

use the ricin in attacks in Europe. The Pentagon drew up a second strike plan. The White House again killed it. This is a quote from a former national security member, "People were more obsessed with developing the coalition to overthrow Saddam than to execute the President's policy of preemption against terrorists."

Then finally the threat turned real in January. Mr. Zarqawi's group, a number of them were arrested in London and they had a ricin lab which was directly connected to the lab in northern Iraq. This was a part of the country Saddam Hussein did not control. The Kurds controlled that area undercover of U.S. air power. So Saddam Hussein did not control this area. And, again, the United States flew over it every day. In fact, we might remember that Colin Powell famously pointed to it when he made his presentation to the National Security Council and said there are terrorists in this camp training in an area where we control the air space and we fly over it every day. But we did not take it out.

And because the Bush administration was more obsessed with building its coalition of the willing, worried that countries some of those the new Europe might fall off from our coalition, those who sent five, ten, or 15 troops to the coalition, if we took out this terrorist camp, they did not do it. And U.S. troops and many others have died because this administration failed to take out that terrorist camp on the three occasions when the Pentagon asked them to do it because they were so obsessed with pursuing a war against Saddam Hussein and his non-existent weapons of mass destruction. Now, he was a bad guy in the world and we are well quit of him, hopefully permanently quit of him soon.

But the point is when this administration turned its eyes away from al Qaeda, and turned its eyes away from the terrorists, and refused to take out Zarqawi, they were making a grave error and people have died because of that error.

FAST FACTS ON THE SPENDING ISSUE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker and Members, I rise tonight to talk about our budget, the Federal budget and enforcing that budget. Now, I came here with Mr. JONES and others with a fairly large class back in 1995 we were elected to Congress. And I will never forget one of the first meetings we were invited to was held by some of the top economics folks here in Washington and folks from the Congressional Budget Office. And they told us at that meeting that if we did not get serious about balancing the budget, we forget now that back throughout most of the 1980s, we were running deficits exceeding \$200

billion, in fact, by today's accounting standards it would have probably approached \$300 billion, but, nonetheless, we had this meeting and at the meeting they told us that if we in Congress did not get serious about balancing the Federal books, that by the time my children got to be my age, they could be facing a tax rate at the Federal level of over 80 percent just to pay the interest on the national debt.

Well, the good news is we got serious about balancing the Federal budget. We limited the growth in Federal spending. We allowed the Federal budget to grow at a slower rate than the average family budget. And the net result is we went from \$275 billion deficits to \$250 billion surpluses. And that happened largely because we controlled Federal spending. From 1995 until 2000, total Federal spending only grew at an average rate of about 3.2 percent.

Now, since 2001, I have to say, Federal spending has grown at more than double that rate, at an average rate of 6.4 percent. You can see that from this chart. In fact, this chart and the 6.4 percent growth in Federal spending assumes that we will actually abide by and live with the very tough budget that this House has passed.

Now, unfortunately, the other body has not passed a budget this year and so we will have to negotiate with some of the folks over there and so the 6.4 percent assumes that we will wind up with the House's very tight numbers in which we freeze large chunks of the Federal budget.

Let me give for the benefit of some of the members and others who may be tuning in, some of the other numbers about the budget. Since 2001, according to the House Committee on the Budget, discretionary spending, that is a way of saying things beyond the entitlements, has gone up an average of 9.7 percent per year. So it is not just about 9/11 and it is not just about the war, it is about a lot of other things we have been spending money on.

Mandatory spending has now increased to a point where mandatory spending, and these are the things which we sometimes call entitlements, Medicare, Social Security, welfare-type benefits, there are a lot of benefits inside the Federal Government that if you qualify for them, you automatically receive them. Mandatory spending or entitlement spending today represents 55 percent of the Federal budget. And this does not include the new entitlement that was created this year under Medicare for prescription drugs which, according to one study, will add over \$16½ trillion of unfunded liabilities to the Federal budget long term.

Finally, let me say and that I think this is important in recognizing how big the budget has become. For the first time since World War II, total Federal spending has reached more than \$20,000 per household in the United States.

Well, what can we do about all of this? Well, what we need to do is get

back to basics. What we did for most of the 1990s we had here in Washington the House and Senate had agreed to what are call spending caps and PAYGO rules. And we need to bring them back. I am not the only one who believes that. Later this week the house is going to vote on some spending caps and PAYGO provisions that I think are long overdue.

Mr. Speaker, I am not the only one who feels that. Let me read what Chairman Alan Greenspan said about PAYGO and spending caps and house Committee on the Budget in July of 2003. I will quote, "I would like to see the restoration of PAYGO and discretionary caps, which essentially will restrain the expansion of the deficit and indeed ultimately contain it." He went on to say, "It did that back in the early 1990s. I thought it was quite surprisingly successful in restraining what had been a budget which had gotten out of kilter. I would like to see those restraints reimposed and, by their very nature, they will bring fiscal responsibility back."

Let me just read what he also said in a Committee on the Budget in 2002 about spending caps and PAYGO. "Restoring fiscal discipline must be a high priority. The progress in the 1990s in reducing budget deficits might have been elusive were it not for the budget rules that had worked far better than many skeptics, myself included," and this is Mr. Greenspan speaking, "myself included had expected."

"Now is not the time to abandon the discipline of the structure that worked so well for so long."

□ 1945

The framework enacted in the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990 must be preserved.

Well, we allowed those spending caps to expire a few years ago; and it is no coincidence that when we allowed the spending caps to expire, Federal spending began to go up at double the rate it went up for most of the 1990s. We will have an opportunity on Thursday to deal with this. Hopefully, we will have a vote on this thing; and we need to return to some form of spending caps and PAYGO.

We have got a tough budget here in the House. We have got to make certain that it gets enforced. I am not the only one who believes that. Dr. Alan Greenspan was saying this a couple of years ago.

THE ECONOMIC OUTLOOK

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GERLACH). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, last week, on the floor of this Chamber, there were two interesting 1-hour presentations. The first hour came from the other side of the aisle, from the Republican side. Members from Texas and

Illinois, Members from Arizona and West Virginia, Members from Florida, Indiana, from my State of Ohio all spoke on the floor and talked about the growing economy, how the American economy is back.

They talked about corporate profits being up. They talked about economic prosperity. They said that our economy was in fine, fine shape. In fact, they quoted President Bush's Secretary of Commerce who said, "It is the best economic climate in my lifetime." That was the first hour.

The next hour a group of us from mostly Ohio, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN), the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. JONES), the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STRICKLAND), was joined by the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY). We, instead of sort of cheerleading this economic growth, we talked instead or related stories from people in our districts and letters we had received about people struggling with stagnating wages, with tuition increases. Ohio State's tuition will go up 13 percent this fall. Akron University's tuition went up 16 percent last fall. We talked about gas prices, people's difficulty of dealing with higher gas prices, of diminishing health care benefits, the employers cutting prescription drug benefits, all of that.

In my State of Ohio, we have lost one out of six manufacturing jobs since President Bush took office. Some 228,000 jobs overall have disappeared in my State since the President took the oath of office in 2001. In fact, because we have lost 2.5 million jobs since he took office, President Bush will be the first President since Herbert Hoover to have had a net loss of jobs.

Now, we can talk about how much corporate profits are up, and that is a good thing for sure. We can talk about some economic growth, and this is a good thing; but when we look at the economy and we look at the kinds of job loss and we think about what that job loss means, first of all, a steelworker in Canton, Ohio; an auto worker in Lorain, Ohio; a textile worker in North Carolina that loses a job that pays \$10 or \$12 or \$15 or \$20 an hour, depending on the plant and the location, what that means when that family loses that job, if perhaps the members of the family can find another job, that certainly will pay less, if they can find anything else, but think what that means to that family and those children and to the schools in that district where that plant closed down.

The city of Cleveland laid off 600 teachers starting this fall. Classrooms in Cleveland now will average 30 students per classroom. Layoffs in my home city of Lorain, several dozen teachers lost their jobs because we have lost industrial jobs. Police and fire are laid off, which is a greater hardship on those families and greater hardship on the communities that they face, which will then have slower police and fire response time.

The person that owns the diner, the waiters and waitresses in the diner